

### *Remarks*

#### a. Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. §112

Claims 1-8 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph as failing to comply with the enablement requirement. As required by the examiner the drawing which has been denoted as FIG. 8 is submitted with this response. FIG. 8 shows the single positioning arm of Claims 1-8. Since this drawing is consistent with FIGS. 1-7 and Claims 1-8, no new matter is disclosed. Applicant asserts that the addition of Claim 8 clarifies Claims 1-8 and overcomes the 35 U.S.C. § 112 rejection of these claims. Corresponding Amendments to the Brief Description of the Drawings and to the Detailed Description have also been made as denoted above. No new matter is disclosed in those amendments to the Specification.

In view of the addition of FIG. 8 and the related amendments to the brief description of the drawings and the detailed description section of the specification, Applicant asserts that the 35 U.S.C. §112 rejection of Claims 1-8 has been overcome.

#### b. Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)

Claims 1, 4, 7-10, 13, 14, 24, 29-31, 36-40, 43, 53, 58-60, 65 and 66 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Rollinger (U.S. Patent 4,054,201) in view of Japanese Patent 2-144321.

Claim 1 has been re-written to include the additional limitations of Claim 2, with Claim 2 being canceled. Claims 3 and 4 have been amended to depend from amended Claim 1.

Claim 5 has been re-written in independent form including all of the limitations of

original Claims 4 and 4 and Claim 6 depends from amended Claim 5. Claims 7 and 8 depend from amended Claim 1.

In view of added FIG. 8, the corresponding amendments to the Specification, and the foregoing amendments to Claim 1 and Claims 3-8, applicant respectfully suggests that Claim 1 and Claims 3-8 are now in condition for allowance.

The Examiner has indicated that Claims 11, 12, 15-23, 25-28, 32-25, 41, 42, 44-52, 54-57 and 61-64 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if re-written in independent form including all limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

Accordingly Claim 9 has been amended to include the limitations of Claim 11, thereby rendering Claim 9 allowable. Further since Claim 10 now depends from allowable Claim 9, Claim 10 is also allowable.

Claim 12 has been re-written in independent form including all limitations of Claim 9, Claim 11 and Claim 12, thereby rendering Claim 12 allowable. Further since Claim 13 depends from Claim 9 which is now allowable, Claim 13 is also allowable as is Claim 14 which depends from Claim 13.

Claim 15 has been re-written in independent form including all the limitations of Claim 9, Claim 13 and Claim 15 and therefore Claim 15 is now allowable. Further Claims 16 and 17 which depends from Claim 15 are also allowable.

Claim 18 has been re-written in independent form including all limitations of Claim 9, Claim 13 and Claim 18 and therefore is now allowable. Likewise Claim 19 has been re-written in independent form including all the limitations of Claim 9, 13 and Claim 19 and

therefore is now allowable. Similarly Claim 20 has been re-written in independent form including all limitations of Claim 9, 13 and 20. Claim 20 therefore is now allowable.

Claim 21 has been re-written in independent form including all limitations of Claim 9 and Claim 21 and therefore is now allowable. Further Claim 22 which depends from Claim 21 is also allowable. Further Claim 23 which depends from Claim 22 is now allowable.

Claim 24 is now allowable as it depends from Claim 9 which is now allowable.

Claim 25 has been re-written in independent form including all limitations of Claim 9, Claim 24 and Claim 25. Likewise, Claim 26 has been re-written in independent form including all limitations of Claim 9, Claim 24 and Claim 26 and is therefore now allowable. Similarly Claim 27 has been re-written in independent form including all limitations of Claim 9, Claim 24 and Claim 27 and therefore is now allowable. Further Claim 28 has been re-written in independent form including all limitations of Claim 9, Claim 24 and Claim 28 and is therefore now allowable.

Claim 29 which now depends from allowable Claim 9 is therefore allowable. Further Claim 30 which depends from Claim 29 and Claim 31 which depends from Claim 30 are now allowable.

Claim 32 has been re-written in independent form including all limitations of Claim 9 and Claim 32 and is therefore now allowable.

Further Claim 33 which depends from Claim 32 and Claim 34 which depends from Claim 33 are now allowable.

Claim 35 has been amended to depend from Claim 9 which now includes all limitations of Claim 9 and Claim 11 and therefore Claim 35 is now allowable. Further Claims

36 and Claim 37 which depend from Claim 9 which is now allowable, are therefore also now allowable.

Claim 38 has been amended to include the limitations of Claim 41 and therefore Claim 38 is now allowable. Claim 41 has been canceled. Claims 39 and 40, which depend from Claim 38, are also now allowable.

Claim 42 has been amended to depend from Claim 38 which is now allowable, and therefore Claim 42 is also allowable.

Claim 43 which depends from Claim 39, which now depends from allowable Claim 38, is also now allowable.

Claim 44 has been re-written in independent form to include all the limitations of original Claim 38, original Claim 39 and original Claim 44 and is therefore now allowable. Further Claims 45 and 46 which depend from Claim 44 are also now allowable.

Claim 47 has been re-written in independent form to include all the limitations of original Claim 38, original Claim 39 and original Claim 47 and therefore Claim 47 is now allowable. Likewise, Claim 48 has been re-written in independent form to include all the limitations of original Claim 38, original Claim 39 and original Claim 48 and is therefore now allowable. Further Claim 49 has been re-written in independent form, including all limitations of original Claim 38, original Claim 39 and original Claim 49 and is therefore now allowable.

Claim 50 has been re-written in independent form to include all limitations of original Claim 38, original Claim 40 and original Claim 50 and is therefore now allowable, as is Claim 51 which depends from Claim 50 and Claim 52 which depends from Claim 51.

Claim 53, which depends from amended and now allowable Claim 38 is also now

allowable. Claim 54 has been re-written in independent form including all limitations of original Claim 38, original Claim 53 and original Claim 54 and is therefore now allowable. Likewise Claim 55 has been re-written in independent form including the limitations of original Claim 38, original Claim 53, and original Claim 55 and is therefore now allowable. Claim 56 has been re-written in independent form including all limitations of original Claim 38, original Claim 53, and original Claim 56 and is therefore now allowable. Claim 57 has been re-written in independent form including all the limitations of original Claim 38, original Claim 53 and original Claim 57 is therefore now allowable.

Claim 59 now depends from amended Claim 38 which is now allowable and therefore Claim 58 is now allowable. Likewise Claim 59 which depends from Claim 58 and Claim 60 which depends from Claim 59 are also now allowable.

Claim 61 has been re-written in independent form including all the limitations of original Claim 38 and original Claim 61 and is therefore now allowable. Further Claim 62 which depends from Claim 61 and Claim 63 which depends from Claim 62 are now allowable.

Claim 64 has been re-written in independent form including all the limitations of original Claim 38, original claim 41, and original Claim 64 an is therefore now allowable.

Claims 65 and 66 which now depend from amended Claim 38, which is now allowable, are also now allowable.

In consideration of the foregoing amendments and the remarks offered above, Claims 1-66, with the exception of Claims 2, 11, 41 and 43, which have been canceled, are now in condition for allowance. All of the amendments to the Claims 9-66 are as suggested by the

Examiner to render these claims allowable. Likewise, the amendment to Claim 1 and claims 3-5 and the cancellation of Claim 2 obviate the rejection of Claims 1-8. Therefore, the rejection of claims 1, 3-10, 12-40, 42 and 44-66 under § 35 U.S.C. 103(a) have been overcome and are now in condition for allowance.


c. Allowed Claims

Examiner has allowed Claims 67-104 and no amendments to these allowed claims has been made.

*Conclusion*

Based on the foregoing drawing, specification and claim amendments and the foregoing remarks, applicant respectfully asserts that Claims 1, 3-10, 12-40, 42, and 44-104 are now allowable. Claims 2, 11, 41 and 43 have been canceled. Applicant therefore requests that this application be passed for issuance for those allowable claims.

Dated this 28 day of July, 2005.



J. David Nelson, 31,046

Attorney for Applicant

NELSON, SNUFFER, DAHLE & POULSEN, P.C.

10885 South State

Sandy, UT 84070

(801) 576-1400